

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
P37153-P0

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/000242

International filing date (day/month/year)
12.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
15.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No II Priority
- ☐ Box No III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/IP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000242

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
- ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
- a. type of material
- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
- b. format of material
- ☐ in written format
- ☐ in computer readable form
- c. time of filing/furnishing
- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000242

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability:
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-19	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	4, 8, 10	YES
	Claims	1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-19	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-19	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP, 2000-105772, A (Sharp Corp.), 11 April, 2000 (11.04.00)
 Document 2: JP, 2002-73684, A (Sun R & P Co., Ltd.), 12 March, 2002 (12.03.02)
 Document 3: JP, 2002-342743, A (Olympus Optical Co., Ltd.), 29 November, 2002 (29.11.02)
 Document 4: JP, 11-39132, A (Sharp Corp.), 12 February, 1999 (12.02.99)

The subject matters of claims 1 and 16-19 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 (Claim 1, paragraphs 113-122) and document 2 (Claim 1, paragraphs 25-36) respectively cited in the ISR. A person skilled in the art could have easily applied the technique described in document 2 in which (1) plural relative thumbnail lists form respective thumbnail groups and (2) the plural thumbnail groups are displayed simultaneously at different reduction rates, to the information management device described in document 1 in which (1) a list of classified plural image files is displayed as thumbnails, and (2) if a specific thumbnail is specified by an input means, the corresponding image file is displayed.

The subject matters of claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 11 and 12 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1, 2 and 3 (Claim 1, paragraphs 48-57) cited in the ISR. A person skilled in the art could have easily applied the technique described in document 3 in which classified image data are displayed as size-reduced images classified into groups (given numbers), to the information management device described in document 1 in which (1) a list of classified plural image files is displayed as thumbnails, and (2) if a specific thumbnail is specified by an input means, the corresponding image file is displayed.

The subject matters of claims 13-15 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 and document 4 (Claim 3, paragraphs 33-40) cited in the ISR. A person skilled in the art could have easily applied the technique described in document 4 in which (1) plural data and files are represented by icons and (2) classified plural icons are displayed in a three-dimensional virtual space, to the information management device described in document 1 in which (1) a list of classified plural image files is displayed as thumbnails, and (2) if a specific thumbnail is specified by an input means, the corresponding image file is displayed.

The subject matters of claims 4, 8 and 10 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a person skilled in the art.